

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7851

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNING, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide graduated rates of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for withholding of tax at source on interest and dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for additional information on certain returns; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 2040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit the deduction of certain expenditures as trade or business expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 123) prescribing rules for the standing, select, or special committees and subcommittees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, one of the unique contributions which America has made to the art of government is the Federal system. It served, in the first instance, in the Constitutional Convention, as a practical compromise between those who believed in a strong central government and those who believed in a loose federation of autonomous States. It has served since that time as a practical means for governing a varied population spread out over a large land area. It is based on the premise that strong local self-government is essential in a democratic society. At the same time, it has enabled us to deal with the emerging problems of an increasingly complex industrial and urban society as we have realistically adjusted to the functions of each of the three levels of government to the nature and scope of the problems.

I happen to believe that a well-balanced Federal system is essential to broad-based participation by our citizens in the processes of government; and that such participation is a condi-

tion to the preservation of our democratic institutions. However, such a balance cannot remain static. The 19th century balance of functions as between the three levels of government would not work today. And tomorrow's balance will depend upon the problems with which we will find it necessary to deal.

Moreover, the three levels of government are not separate compartments insulated from each other. The problems with which each level is concerned, the services which each renders, are all part of our national economic, social, and political fabric. There are areas of exclusive jurisdiction by one level of government. There are areas of parallel activities. There are areas of cooperative effort.

The growth of our population, its increasing concentration in urban areas, the increasing complexity of our economy and our society as a result of the industrial revolution, have inevitably resulted in the growth of government itself. The resulting regulatory activities and governmental services have developed within the framework of the Federal system and have accrued to various levels of government, in accordance with the pressures of varying times and circumstances.

The division of responsibilities thus gradually established has been the subject of scrutiny and controversy for the past half century. There are, of course, strongly held differences of opinion as to whether certain functions are assigned to the proper level of government. Notwithstanding these differences of opinion, and however they may be resolved, we face the fact that the Federal system is performing today's governmental chores and that it is not doing so in all instances as effectively and efficiently as it might. As I have said, this has been a subject of considerable study for some time. One such study was made by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, also known as the Kestnbaum Commission, which was established by the Congress in 1953 and which issued its final report in June 1955. That study was concerned chiefly with an evaluation of the philosophy and principles of federalism.

Another recent study, which is still in progress, is being conducted by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee which was organized pursuant to a recommendation by the President made to the Governors' conference on June 24, 1957. The express purpose of the Committee, made up of Governors and Federal officials, is to designate grant-aided functions which States are ready and willing to assume and to determine revenue adjustments needed to enable States to assume such functions.

A third study, conducted by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, has been giving particular attention to the report of the Kestnbaum Commission, giving special emphasis to the Federal grant-in-aid programs.

That subcommittee transmitted its excellent report to the House on August 8,

1958. The report concluded that it is now desirable to concentrate on the practical and continuing problem of seeking to improve the operation of our Federal system, and particularly the design and consistency of the innumerable Federal grants.

To provide an instrument for this purpose, I am today introducing, on behalf of myself and Senators HUMPHREY, ERVIN, CASE of New Jersey, McCARTHY, HARTKE, and COOPER, a bill to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The proposed Commission would not duplicate the work of either the Kestnbaum Commission or the Joint Federal-State Action Committee. Rather, it would serve as a central clearinghouse for information on all aspects of intergovernmental relations; it would serve as a forum for discussion of specific problems and particular programs; it would give specialized attention, on a continuing basis, to particular intergovernmental problems with a view to promoting greater cooperation among the various levels of government and providing a systematic means for encouraging better relations among them. It would provide technical assistance and make recommendations as to the desirable allocation of government responsibilities and solving particular intergovernmental problems, with particular reference to emerging problems. It would undertake to review existing grant programs with a view to evaluation of their achievements and suggesting the directions in which they should move.

This bill is identical to H.R. 6904, which was introduced in the House by Representative FOUNTAIN and to a companion bill, H.R. 6905, which was introduced by Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, the ranking minority member on the Fountain subcommittee.

The purpose of the bill, and the function of the proposed Commission, might be illustrated by brief reference to some of the specific problems which were pinpointed by the Fountain subcommittee in its report:

First. Because grant proposals have emerged from various and sundry sources, almost inevitably features have been adopted in individual programs which tend to weaken the grant structure as a whole.

Second. Features such as provision for judicial review of Federal administrative decisions and the degree of equalization contained in grant formulas vary considerably between grant programs.

Third. Increasingly, State per capita personal income is used as an element in grant formulas, and there appears to be a need for a reexamination of the soundness of such a criterion in terms of achieving program objectives.

Fourth. State and local officials ought to have specific information as to how proposed Federal aid programs could be expected to affect their States or localities.

Fifth. As consideration is given to new programs or the amendment of old programs, there is a need for some means of studying such proposals in the perspective of the whole grant system and of obtaining current information as to

7852

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 21

the needs and views of States and municipalities.

Sixth. There is a need for periodic review of grant programs in order to determine their accomplishments and the extent of unmet needs or to consider whether or not the programs should be continued.

Seventh. There is insufficient data available indicating the relative fiscal effort being made by States and localities in areas of present or proposed Federal grant programs.

Eighth. There is a wide variation in program practices and standards.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the outstanding report of the Fountain subcommittee. My interest in the subject originates with my experiences as Governor of Maine and my firm conviction that effective and efficient government requires that we work constantly in the job of improving relationships between the three levels of government.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues, and that it be held at the desk for 1 week, for the purpose of giving other Senators an opportunity to cosponsor it if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 2026) to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a permanent bipartisan commission to be known as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. Because the complexity of modern life intensifies the need in a federal form of government for the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government, and because population growth and scientific developments portend an increasingly complex society in future years, it is essential that an appropriate agency be established to give continuing attention to intergovernmental problems.

It is intended that the Commission, in the performance of its duties, will—

(1) bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems;

(2) provide a forum for discussing the administration and coordination of Federal grant and other programs requiring intergovernmental cooperation;

(3) give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

(4) make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the

Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

(5) encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation; and

(6) recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions and responsibilities among the several levels of government.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-four members, as follows:

(1) Six appointed by the President of the United States, three of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and three private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience or familiarity with relations between the levels of government;

(2) Three appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Four appointed by the President from a panel of at least six Governors submitted by the Governors' conference;

(5) Three appointed by the President from a panel of at least five members of State legislative bodies submitted by the board of managers of the Council of State Governments;

(6) Four appointed by the President from a panel of at least six mayors submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(7) One appointed by the President from a panel of at least two elected county officers submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) The members appointed from private life under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), two shall be from the majority party of the respective houses; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a), not more than two shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (a), not more than one shall be from any one State; at least two of the appointees under paragraph (6) of subsection (a) shall be from cities under five hundred thousand population.

(c) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be two years, but members shall be eligible for reappointment.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The President shall convene the Commission within ninety days following enactment of this Act at such time and place as he may designate for the Commission's initial meeting. The President, or his designee, shall serve as the Commission's temporary Chairman pending the election of a permanent Chairman.

(b) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made; except that where the number of vacancies is fewer than the number of members specified in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of section 3(a), each panel of names submitted in accordance with the aforementioned paragraphs shall contain at least one name more than the number of vacancies.

(d) Where any member ceases to serve in the official position from which originally appointed under section 3(a), his place on the Commission shall be deemed to be vacant.

(e) Twelve members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but two or more members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting hearings.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to engage in such activities and to make such studies and investigations as are necessary or desirable in the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 2 of this Act;

(2) to consider, on its own initiative, ways and means for fostering better relations between the levels of government;

(3) to submit an annual report to the President and the Congress on or before January 31 of each year. The Commission may also submit such additional reports to the President, to the Congress or any committee of the Congress, and to any unit of government or organization as the Commission may deem appropriate.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or members thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or members thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint, fix the compensation of, and remove a staff director without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. Such appointment shall be made solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position and without regard to political affiliation.

(d) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, and without reference to political affiliation, shall have the power—

(1) to appoint, fix the compensation of, and remove such other personnel as he deems necessary,

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) but at rates not to exceed \$50 a day for individuals.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, persons in the employ of the Commission under subsections (c) and (d)(1) of this section shall be considered to be Federal employees for all purposes, including—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251-2267),

(2) the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103),

(3) annual and sick leave, and

(4) the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835-842).

(f) No individual employed in the service of the Commission shall be paid compensation for such employment at a rate in excess of \$20,000 per annum.

COMPENSATION OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

SEC. 7. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress, officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government, Governors, or full-time salaried officers of city and county governments shall serve without compensation in addition to that

received in their regular public employment, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses, including subsistence (or, in the alternative, a per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed the rate prescribed in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended), without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835-842), the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, or section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (5 U.S.C. 73b), and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsection (a) is applicable, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission, as provided for in subsection (a) of this section.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased to join the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and other Senators on both sides of the aisle in sponsoring a bill to establish a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Identical bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, and Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Incidentally, Representative DWYER is the occupant of the seat which I held for a number of years in the House, and which, after me, was held by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

For many years the need for continuing attention to the problems of intergovernmental relationships has been widely recognized. Under our Federal system the interrelation of Federal, State, and local governmental units has presented, throughout our history, problems of great magnitude. The rapid growth of grants-in-aid and other cooperative programs in recent decades has only served to increase the complexity of these problems.

In an effort to evaluate and improve the numerous activities pertaining to intergovernmental relations, a number of excellent studies have been made in the past on the subject, notably by the first Hoover Commission and the well-known Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. More recently, the House Committee on Government Operations completed an intensive 3-year survey throughout the country drawing together information and suggestions from officials at all levels of government.

As a result of these studies, both the Hoover Commission and the House Committee on Government Operations have recommended the establishment of a continuing agency or commission on Federal-State relations with primary responsibility for study, information, and guidance in this field.

The bill which I am pleased to co-sponsor today, as well as the identical bills already introduced in the House, is a direct outgrowth of this recommendation.

In my opinion, the establishment of a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations would be a significant step forward in the improvement of our Federal system. Our Federal system cannot function properly if the States and their subdivisions lose their will and capacity to cope with problems traditionally within their purview. By finding better and more efficient methods of administering and controlling cooperative programs between the various levels of Government, the proposed Commission would do much to preserve the health of our States and to insure the continued vitality of our Federal system.

PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN INDIAN FUNDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

In 1959 Congress appropriated in a supplemental appropriation bill a sum of \$416,240.85, which represented the recovery made by the Siletz Indians before the Indian Claims Commission for inadequate compensation paid them for lands taken under an 1892 agreement with the United States.

Congress enacted a statute in 1954 providing for the termination of Federal supervision and control over certain tribes in Oregon, including the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians. Section 3 of the 1954 act prescribed that a final roll would be prepared containing the names of all tribal members living on the date of the act. That roll was used for the purpose of distributing tribal assets. The bill which I have introduced would provide for the distribution of the judgment fund on the basis of this already prepared tribal roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2029) to authorize a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the confederated tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HUMANE METHODS OF TRAPPING ANIMALS AND BIRDS ON CERTAIN LANDS AND WATERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the use of inhumane traps for the capture of animals or birds on the lands and waters belonging to, or under the jurisdiction of, the United States of America.

Representative BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, has introduced a companion measure in the other body.

Although trapping no longer plays so significant a role in our economy as it did in the early days of our history, it is, nevertheless, still a substantial industry. It is, therefore, I believe, one of the most unhappy anachronisms of our modern, comfortable civilization that the primitive, cruel, trapping practices of the last century are still in use today.

I have myself seen wild animals exhausted from battling the steel jaws of a relentless leg-hold trap. I have snowshoed over a trap route and seen animals which tried to gnaw off their paws to escape the agony of the traps. Many animals fracture a leg or a bone in these cruel devices. They are held there struggling, often for hours or even days, before being found and killed.

Last year we passed legislation to bring about more humane practices to our slaughterhouses. We found, in considering the humane slaughter bill, that the technology which has given us push-button automobile transmissions and color television can indeed provide us with civilized means for the necessary slaughter of our food animals. The same wonders of modern technology can give us humane methods of trapping.

In the 2 years since my humane trapping bill was first introduced, amateur and professional trappers have carried on extensive testing, and manufacturers have devoted considerable effort to perfecting of traps which capture animals painlessly or kill them instantaneously. Game commissions and departments of conservation in the various States have conducted many days of field tests with several types of humane traps. The Defenders of Furbearers, a nonprofit organization, has rendered a splendid service in distributing these traps for testing and in compiling results of the tests.

The results of these tests, Mr. President, are most encouraging. Not only do the traps capture the animals with less cruelty, they are also less damaging to the valuable pelts which are sought. Consequently, humane societies and trappers alike have been enthusiastic in their support of the new traps.

My bill proposes only that traps used within the jurisdiction of the United States must either capture animals painlessly or kill them instantly, and that the traps must be inspected and emptied at least once a day. The Secretary of the Interior would have authority to conduct necessary tests and establish necessary standards to give specific application to the objectives of the bill. Violations would be punishable by fines up to \$500 or prison sentences up to 6 months.

Such legislation would update commercial trapping practices from primitive cruelty to humaneness consistent with American moral standards of the 20th century.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately re-

ferred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2030) to require the use of humane methods of trapping animals and birds on lands and waterways under the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 41 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by placing the prefix "(a)" before the present section, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Any person who, upon any land or waters owned by or under the jurisdiction of the United States, places or causes to be placed any trap, snare, net or other device designed to trap or capture any animal or bird in any manner by which the animal or bird is not either captured painlessly or killed instantly, or who, having placed a trap, snare, net or other device, fails to inspect and empty it at least once every twenty-four hours, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to conduct such tests and to promulgate such standards, rules, and regulations as he may deem necessary to the execution of this subsection.

"(3) No provision of this subsection shall apply in any case in which its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States to any Indian in effect on the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1960.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission on Country Life.

We all realize that we live in an age of tremendous technological and social changes. Since World War II there have been few areas of our lives untouched by new and sometimes revolutionary advances. These changes have resulted from the outpouring of money and time and scientific devotion to basic and applied research in the fields of science and medicine; manufacturing, and industrial processes; in almost everything that touches our daily lives. In all of these realms, research established the facts upon which to base plans and experiments and growth.

As our cities have grown in response to industrial growth, the increasing population has pushed out into suburbs. Industry itself has in many cases moved from congested metropolitan areas into the surrounding countryside. The expanding network of superhighways that shrinks distances has played an important role in this dispersal of population and industry.

We must remember that more is concerned here than just the financial or convenience values resulting from this decentralization and change. We are concerned with the impact of these things on people. The urbanization of rural areas within a brief time period

confronts us with many new human problems. In our rural areas, both the expansion and the shifting of population affect seriously the local institutions. In some States new ghost towns are appearing. These are communities which now find themselves bypassed because new highways induce the residents, both rural and suburban, to travel to other community centers which have developed to fit the changing needs of the people.

Some changes in the rural picture have resulted in improvements; some have brought about pockets of economic stagnation; and all have had an effect, for good or ill, on the people and their institutions—the business community, the churches, the schools, the recreational opportunities, the health facilities, and local governments. In many cases, the average age level of a rural community's population has changed drastically. In some there are demands for new schools to fill the needs of an expanding school-age population. In others, the need is for the consolidation of existing schools, possibly over a wide area, in order to attain the best academic training with the funds available. Some communities are faced with an aging, low-income population which poses special health, recreation, and institutional problems. Churches are confronted with new problems and responsibilities as populations shift and communities change.

The falling farm prices and reduced farm income experienced by family farmers in these past few years have posed special problems for this group. The bare census statistic that there are 90,000 fewer farms in 1959 than there were in 1952 does not by any means give a picture of what this shift means in terms of people and the kinds of lives they live. It means that more and more farmers, and their boys and girls, have left the land and moved to the cities. When they move from low income farming areas where facilities for individual development have been few, they may be inadequately trained in vocational skills to enable them to meet the challenges of new modes of life in ways that will improve their standard of living. Accelerated programs of vocational training are badly needed by these young people.

Of the 4,600,000 families still remaining on the farm, almost one-third have cash incomes from all sources of less than \$1,200 a year. We need farm policies and programs designed to improve the lot of this group as well as improved farm legislation to better the income situation of all commercial family farms. Low farm income is not a symptom of inefficiency; it is an evidence of lack of opportunity.

Some rural communities and their institutions may be able to face up to and solve the evolving problems, but anything that is accomplished is done on a haphazard, catch-as-catch-can basis. Secretary of Agriculture Benson's rural development program, while based on a worthy principle, is a hesitant and severely limited approach to an area where much coordinated research and planning are needed.

Our first move should be to establish the facts regarding these rural communities so that intelligent plans for the future can be made—the best social good must be established as a goal, and steps taken to see that community life develops along lines that have a reasonable chance of reaching that goal.

To do this we must turn to that excellent tool of all science, research. This bill which Senator Young and I are sponsoring asks for the establishment of a Country Life Commission, an independent group charged with the responsibility of delineating and giving direction to the task of planning a fact-findings study of country life.

This Commission, as proposed in this bill, would consist of 15 members. I would anticipate that these members would be selected because of their broad understanding of every important phase of rural life. Of special significance would be their knowledge of the changes which are affecting the rural institutions which have been the mainsprings of our rural culture. I would envisage that rural sociologists and religious leaders and businessmen would play important roles in planning the scope and direction of this study. Differing sections of the Nation would need to be studied and analyzed. The members of the Country Life Commission would set the guidelines; the actual studies then might well be conducted by the State universities and agricultural colleges.

There is an honorable and historic precedent for such a Country Life Commission. It was 51 years ago that President Theodore Roosevelt established such a Commission. Those who have read the three books which came out of that first country life study testify that the information set forth was of exceedingly great value for many, many years.

Mr. President, we need all the light we can get on the present conditions and possible future trends of rural life if the family farmers of America are going to have the chance to adjust to the changing times and share fairly in the expanding opportunities of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2031) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to establish uniform rules of procedure for Senate committees including several new rules dealing with their conduct of investigations.

The major new procedural rules called for in my resolution would provide:

First. Every witness shall be informed of the subject matter of the investigation in which he is called to testify by a